

REMARKS

1. Summary of Office Action

In the Office action mailed June 10, 2004, the Examiner objected to claims 1-15 because of claim wording that is not clear and that can easily be misleading to the nature of the claim. In particular, the Examiner objected to the limitation of claim 1 that recites "a clock generating means for clocks necessary for controlling the BTS and the BSM based on time and frequency clocks received from a global positioning system (GPS)." Further, in particular, the Examiner objected to the limitation of claim 4 that recites "and ATM cell arrange of the ATM signal adapt handling means." The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,049,543 (Sauer et al.) in view of the Applicants' admitted prior art. And the Examiner indicated that claims 2-15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims.

2. Amendments and Pending Claims

Applicants have (i) amended claims 2-4, 10, 12, and 15, (ii) cancelled claim 1, and (iii) added new claims 16-21. Now pending in this application are claims 2-21 of which claims 2, 10, and 15 are independent claims.

3. Response to Claim Objections

As noted above, the Examiner objected to (i) claims 1-15 because of claim wording, and (ii) claims 2-15 because claims 2-15 depend upon a rejected base claim. The Examiner indicated that claims 2-15 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims.

The Applicants have cancelled claim 1 and thus the objection to claim 1 is moot. The Applicants have amended claim 4 to clarify the recited limitation objected to by the Examiner. And the Applicants have amended claims 2, 10, and 15 to include all of the limitations of the rejected base claim upon which these claims depended and to clarify the recited limitation objected to by the Examiner in the rejected base claim. Applicants submit that claims 2, 10, and 15 are now in a condition for allowance. Further, because claims 3-9, 11-14, and 16-21 incorporate by reference either claim 2, 10, or 15, claims 3-9, 11-14, and 16-21 are necessarily in a condition for allowance as well.

4. Response to §103 Rejection

As noted above, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The Applicants have cancelled claim 1 and thus the rejection of this claim is moot.


5. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-21 are now in a condition for allowance, and respectfully request favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims. If the Examiner would like to discuss this case, the Examiner is welcomed to contact the undersigned at (312) 913-3305.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 9, 2004

By:


Robert J. Irvine
Reg. No. 41,865